



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,298	07/12/2001	Mark Stephen Webb	30566.155-US-01	3888
22462	7590 06/17/2004		EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050			BECKER, SHAWN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ES, CA 90045		2173	.7
			DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004	<u> </u>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		AL			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/905,298	WEBB, MARK STEPHEN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Shawn M. Becker	2173			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Faiture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a rep ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTh e, cause the application to become ABAI	ly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
<i>'</i> =	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examino	er.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 July 2001</u> is/are: a)					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• ,	·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, •	, ,			
,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea 	ts have been received. ts have been received in Ap prity documents have been re tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not re	eceived.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u>. 		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-11, 14, 16, 18-21, 24, 26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) and U.S. Patent No. 6,039,047 to Rock et al. (hereinafter Rock).

Referring to claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16, 21, 24, and 26, the AAPA teaches a method, article of manufacture, and system for collapsing ("minimizing") a dialog window of an application that displays a complete dialog window of a currently active application (i.e. Fig. 1) on a display device, determines a location of a cursor with respect to the dialog window (i.e. if the cursor is over minimize button 108), displays a collapsed version of the dialog window, wherein the collapsed version of the dialog window consumes a smaller area of the display device than the complete dialog window, and displays the complete dialog window when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the dialog window (i.e. when the cursor selects the "maximize option within the minimized dialog window). See page 4, line 22 – page 5, line 13.

The AAPA teaches collapsing a dialog window when a minimize button is pressed and not when a cursor is simply moved outside of the complete dialog window without additional action. The AAPA also does not teach displaying the complete dialog

Art Unit: 2173

window when the cursor is moved within the collapsed version without additional action. However, Rock teaches a method of resizing a control region (col. 4, lines 4-14) when a cursor is moved outside of the control region (col. 1, lines 20-32 and col. 3, lines 47-51) such that the control region is made smaller upon the cursor moving outside of the region and larger upon the cursor moving inside the control region. Since collapsing is a type of resizing, and a dialog window is a type of control region, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dialog window of the AAPA such that the collapsing occurs upon the cursor moving outside of the dialog window as taught by Rock in order to provide a simple and efficient way to make the dialog window (control region) less distracting as supported by Rock without requiring the dexterity to select a small "minimize button".

Referring to claim 8, 18, and 28, the combination of the AAPA and Rock teaches that the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed when the cursor moves outside of the dialog window, *supra*, for a minimum time period (i.e. the time is takes for the machine to recognize the cursor is outside of the region/window).

Referring to claim 9, 19, and 29, the ability to display a collapsed version of a dialog window in the AAPA is controlled by a selectable system icon displayed in a title bar of the dialog window (i.e. Fig. 1, 108).

Referring to claims 10, 20, and 30, the AAPA describes that the dialog box may be modeless. See page 3, lines 10-14.

Art Unit: 2173

3. Claims 2-3, 5, 12-13, 15, 22-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA, Rock, and U.S. Patent No. 6,335,745 to Amro et al. (hereinafter Amro).

Referring to claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22-23, it is implied that the title bar of the AAPA and Rock (i.e. AAPA at Fig. 1, 106) is retained and displayed even when the dialog window is collapsed, however the AAPA and Rock do not explicitly state that the collapsed dialog window comprises a title bar of the dialog window or that the collapsed dialog window exactly encompasses a title of the dialog window and system buttons. However, Amro shows a minimized window (i.e. Fig. 4, 144) that displays a title bar, wherein the title bar exactly encompasses the title (i.e. Fig. 4, 148) of the window and system buttons (i.e. icons; Fig. 4, 114). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure the collapsed dialog window of the AAPA comprised a size exactly encompassing a title [bar] and system buttons as shown in Amro in order to identify and redisplay the full size dialog window.

Referring to claims 5, 15, and 25, the AAPA and Rock do not explicitly teach that system buttons are in a same position in the collapsed version of the dialog window as when the complete dialog window is displayed. However, Amro shows system buttons in Fig. 6, 102 of a collapsed window that are each in the same position within the graphical selection area 102 as in the complete window (Fig. 4). At col. 7, lines 30-48, Amro describes that the location of this graphical selection area may vary, implying that it may be programmed to remain in the same position. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to maintain system buttons in the same position of the

Art Unit: 2173

collapsed dialog window of the AAPA and Rock as in the complete dialog window in order to maintain consistency in the placement of the buttons to easily find the appropriate button/function within the collapsed view (graphical selection area) as supported by Amro (i.e. col. 47-55).

4. Claims 7, 17, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA, Rock, and Microsoft® Word 2000 ©1999 (hereinafter Word) as supported by the attached screenshots.

Referring to claims 7, 17, and 27, the AAPA and Rock do not disclose that the focus is reverted to another window of the application without additional action by a user when the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed. However, screenshot 2 of Word shows a dialog box open in Word, and screenshot 3 is the result of minimizing the dialog box in screenshot 2. No further action was taken, and it is clear that Document1 of Word has focus as evidenced by the depressed representation in the taskbar and that the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed (the rightmost application displayed in the taskbar in screenshot 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to revert focus to another window of the currently active application of the AAPA when the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed without further action as shown in Word in order to eliminate the need to click on a window to restore focus.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to

Art Unit: 2173

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach methods of collapsing windows, detecting cursor proximity in order to open, close, or resize a window, programming the placement of buttons after resizing, and window modality.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn M. Becker whose telephone number is (703) 305-7756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smb

BAHUYNH IMARY EXAMNER